

REMARKS

Claims 2-27, 29-45, and 59-68 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has allowed claims 2-27 and 29-45, rejected claims 59 and 65-68, and objected to claims 60-64.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has allowed claims 2-27 and 29-45. Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claims 60-64 as being dependent on a rejected base claim. The Examiner suggested that claims 60-64 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant submits that claims 60-64 are allowable because they rely on claim 59, which is allowable for at least the reasons discussed further below. Therefore, Applicant has not amended these dependent claims in this Amendment.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 59 and 65-68 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,570 to Hayes *et al.* (“Hayes”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Hayes does not teach or suggest “a second register that receives and stores the address *from the first register* on a second transition of the clock signal” as recited in claim 59 (emphasis added). Hayes teaches that addresses are loaded into the SRAM array address register on the rising edge of the clock signal. (Hayes, col. 6, lines 12-15). Further, Hayes teaches that “[a]t time 53, the first address of the write block is loaded into the cache control

address register 140.” (Hayes, col. 6, lines 31-33). However, Hayes does not teach a second register that “receives and stores the address *from the first register* on a second transition of the clock signal,” as is recited in claim 59. Furthermore, Hayes does not teach “a first memory block coupled to receive the address from the first register; and a second memory block coupled to receive the address from the second register,” as is recited in claim 59.

For at least this reason, claim 59 is allowable over Hayes. Claims 60-68, which respectively depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 59 are therefore also allowable over Hayes for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

Claims 2-27, 29-45, and 59-68 are pending in this application. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's acknowledgement of allowable claims 2-27 and 29-45, but respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider its rejection of claims 59 and 65-68, and objection to claims 60-64, for the reason stated above. If the Examiner contemplates a different action, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative by phone at 650-849-6622 or by e-mail at gary.edwards@finnegan.com.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 20, 2005

By:



Gary J. Edwards
Reg. No. 41,008

Express Mail Label No.
EV 606105796 US